

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the interview conducted on October 10, 2007. The interview clarified several issues and enabled Applicants to better focus the present Amendment to expedite allowance of the present application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8 and 15. Applicants' claim amendments are shown on the pages above following the heading AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS. On these pages, the deletions are ~~struck through~~ while the insertions are underlined.

Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, and Applicants earnestly request such action. Below, Applicants address each of the Examiner's reasons for rejection.

B. All Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References Gonzalez in view of Anderson

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0088445 to Gonzalez et al. ("Gonzalez") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0190536 to Anderson et al. ("Anderson"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Anderson and traverse these rejections.

Claims 1-7

Various preferred embodiments of the present application define, *inter alia*, a PCI-Express slot for coupling PCI-Express devices to a host system including a processor. The PCI-Express slot comprises a PCI-Express connector configured to receive a card to couple at least two of the PCI-Express devices using at least two independent sets of PCI-Express lanes. The PCI-Express slot is located on a motherboard of the host system and the host system processor communicates with the PCI-Express devices without using a bridge.

By contrast, Gonzalez discloses a motherboard for supporting multiple graphics cards. The Examiner admits that Gonzalez does not disclose or suggest a connector for receiving a card to couple two independent sets of PCI-Express lanes without using a PCI-Express bridge.

However, the Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Anderson discloses a method for expanding PC functionality while maintaining reliability and stability. With reference to paragraphs 0051 and 0052 and Figures 6-8 of Anderson, all PCI-Express lanes connect to the north bridge 264. Thus, the processor 258 can only communicate with the PCI-Express devices through the bridge. Applicants' Claim 1 specifically recites that "the host system processor communicates with the PCI-Express devices *without* using a bridge." (emphasis added)

Since neither Gonzalez nor Anderson nor the combination thereof discloses or suggests a PCI-Express slot for coupling multiple PCI-Express devices to a host system in which a host system processor communicates with the PCI-Express devices *without* using a bridge, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is allowable over Gonzalez in view of Anderson. Dependent Claims 2-7, which include the features of independent Claim 1, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. The combination of Gonzalez and Anderson does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 2-7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Claims 8-14

Various preferred embodiments of the present application define, *inter alia*, a system for coupling plural PCI-Express devices to a host system including a processor. The system comprises a motherboard with a PCI-Express slot. The slot has a PCI-Express connector configured to receive a card to couple at least two of the PCI-Express devices using at least two independent sets of PCI-Express lanes. The host system processor communicates with the PCI-Express devices without using a bridge.

As explained in detail above with respect to Claim 1, neither Gonzalez nor Anderson nor the combination thereof discloses or suggests a host system processor that communicates with multiple PCI-Express devices without using a bridge. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claim 8 is allowable over Gonzalez in view of Anderson. Dependent Claims 9-14, which include the features of independent Claim 8, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons

presented above. The combination of Gonzalez and Anderson does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 8, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 9-14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Claims 15-21

5 Various preferred embodiments of the present application define, *inter alia*, a PCI-Express connector in a PCI-Express slot on a mother board of a host system. The host system includes a processor. The connector is configured to couple at least two PCI-Express devices to the host system. The host system processor communicates with the PCI-Express devices without using a bridge.

10 As explained in detail above with respect to Claim 1, neither Gonzalez nor Anderson nor the combination thereof discloses or suggests a host system processor that communicates with multiple PCI-Express devices without using a bridge. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 is allowable over Gonzalez in view of Anderson. Dependent Claims
15 16-21, which include the features of independent Claim 15, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above. The combination of Gonzalez and Anderson does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 15, let alone the unique combinations of features recited by Claims 16-21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If there is any further hindrance to allowance of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

5 Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1159.

10 Date: 10/17/07.

Respectfully submitted,



15

Tejinder Singh
Reg. No.: 39,535
Attorney for Applicant
KLEIN, O'NEILL & SINGH, LLP
43 Corporate Park, Suite 204
Irvine, CA 92606
Tel.: (949) 955-1920
Fax: (949) 955-1921

20